

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/516,194	03/01/2000	LETTS L GORDON		3420
25270 7	7590 11/25/2003		EXAM	INER
EDWARD D GRIEFF			GERSTL, ROBERT	
HALE & DORR LLP 1455 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			1626	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		09/516,194	TAM ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Robert Gerstl	1626
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	eation appears on the cover shet with	th the correspondence address
THE - External after if the indicate in the in	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC ensions of time may be available under the provisions of r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication provision for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set or exten	CATION.  f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a renication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON will, by statute, cause the application to become AB.	pply be timely filed  r (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <u>29 <i>August 2003</i></u> .	
2a) <u></u>	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 28	b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3)□ Disposit	Since this application is in condition f closed in accordance with the practic ion of Claims		
4)🖂	Claim(s) 2,4-8,10-40 and 104-107 is/s	are pending in the application.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) 18-40 and 104-106 is/are allo	owed.	
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>2,4-8,14-17 and 107</u> is/are re	ejected.	
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.	
<b>Applicat</b>	ion Papers		
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.	
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by th	ne Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any object	ction to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed	on is: a)□ approved b)□ di	sapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are requ	uired in reply to this Office action.	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to b	by the Examiner.	
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority de	ocuments have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority de	ocuments have been received in Ap	pplication No
* 5		f the priority documents have been in tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). for a list of the certified copies not re	
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	·	
	)   The translation of the foreign lang	, ,	
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for		
Attachmen	it(s)		
2) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pap	O-948) 5) Notice of Ir	nummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)  Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/516,194 Page 2

Art Unit: 1626

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

- 2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being fully anticipated by Morozowich. Example 9 anticipates the instant compounds where R1=OD1=OD=OK=O-Wa-Eb-T-Q; Wa =C(O), Eb=aryl i.e. phenyl, T= bond, Q=NO2, p, c, x, d, y, l, j, g, z =0.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1626

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

- 6. Claims 2, 4-8, 14-17, 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezuglov or Del Soldato in view of Garvey(437), Garvey(863), and Bandarage. The primary references both teach <u>Nitro</u>prostagandin compounds that have been excluded by the proviso in the claims. The three secondary references in various drugs teach the equivalence of nitro and nitroso as agents for releasing nitric oxide, rendering the analogous <u>Nitroso</u>prostaglandins obvious. For example, both Bezuglov and Garvey(437) teach the compounds useful for treating impotence. Thus it would be obvious to prepare nitroso analogues of the nitro compounds of the primary references and obtain the same desired results.
- 7. Claim 107 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for nitroso esters, does not reasonably provide enablement for nitroso compounds attached to the carbon skeleton of the prostaglandin compound. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Gerstl whose telephone number is 703 308-4531. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe McKane can be reached on 703 308-4537. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1235.

Robert Gerstl Primary Examiner Art Unit 1626 Page 4

RG